Comparison of clumped isotope signatures of dolomite cements to fluid inclusion thermometry in the temperature range of 73–176 °C
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Abstract

Widespread application of the novel clumped isotope paleothermometer (Δ47) using dolomite samples from shallow crustal settings has been hindered by a lack of adequate constraints on clumped isotope systematics in dolomites that formed at temperatures greater than 50 °C. Consequently, many high-temperature applications involving diagenetic dolomites have required an assumption that the relationship between temperature and Δ47 in diagenetic dolomites resembles the theoretical temperature dependence for calcite. Here we present Δ47 results from dolomite cements for which precipitation temperatures were determined independently using fluid inclusion microthermometry. We compare a rock-based “calibration” for samples from the temperature range of ~73 to 176 °C to previously published laboratory-derived calibrations for synthetic calcites. This novel combination of approaches yields results that are broadly consistent with results reported from controlled laboratory experiments, providing an important confirmation of the utility of clumped isotopes in real-world systems. Our results suggest that the Δ47 of dolomite cements may provide key information in the reconstruction of burial and thermal histories and also in the recognition of potential petroleum reservoirs.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Clumped isotopes; Dolomite; Calibration

1. INTRODUCTION

In the years since its introduction in 2006 (Ghosh et al., 2006a), the carbonate “clumped isotope” paleothermometer (Δ47), which utilizes the thermodynamically controlled “clumping” of 13C and 18O as recorded in carbonate minerals, has been applied to a variety of geoscience questions that were previously thought to be intractable (Ghosh et al., 2006b; Came et al., 2007; Garzione et al., 2008; Affek et al., 2008; Eagle et al., 2010, 2011; Huntington et al., 2010, 2011; Passey et al., 2010; Csank et al., 2011; Keating-Bitonti et al., 2011; Finnegan et al., 2011; Brand et al., 2012; Tripati et al., 2014; Dale et al., 2014; Kluge et al., 2014). The utility of this novel proxy spans a broad...
range of subdisciplines within the geosciences, with recent applications including: paleoaltimetry reconstructions of the Andes (Ghosh et al., 2006b) and the Colorado Plateau (Huntington et al., 2010); estimates of the body temperatures of dinosaurs and other extinct vertebrates (Eagle et al., 2010, 2011); reconstructions of diagenetic and burial histories (Ferry et al., 2011; Huntington et al., 2011; Bristow et al., 2011; Loyd et al., 2012; Budd et al., 2013; Dale et al., 2014; Henkes et al., 2014; Shenton et al., 2015); investigations into the evolution of the early solar system using meteorites (Guo and Eiler, 2007; Halevy et al., 2011); and paleoclimate reconstructions using paleoosols (Passey et al., 2010; Suarez et al., 2011; Eagle et al., 2013b; Quade et al., 2013), carbonate fossils (Came et al., 2007; Csank et al., 2011; Finnegan et al., 2011; Keating-Bitonti et al., 2011; Zaarur et al., 2011; Brand et al., 2012; Tripati et al., 2014; Douglas et al., 2014), and speleothems (Affek et al., 2008; Daëron et al., 2011; Kluge et al., 2014).

The application of the \( \Delta_{47} \) paleothermometer in the reconstruction of burial and diagenetic histories (Ferry et al., 2011; Huntington et al., 2011; Bristow et al., 2011; Loyd et al., 2013; Dale et al., 2014; Henkes et al., 2014) is of increasing interest, particularly because it can help ascertain whether or not a potential petroleum reservoir rock experienced temperatures in excess of the oil and gas “windows” (~50 to 150 and 150 to 200 °C, respectively) (Peters et al., 2005). However, many applications involving diagenetic temperatures utilize the mineral dolomite, for which calibration data are limited. Dolomites are calcium magnesium carbonate minerals that are predominantly secondary and are not primary, except for protodolomites found in sabkhas, and occur in both low and high temperature settings. Notably, the single published comprehensive \( \Delta_{47} \) calibration equation for temperatures greater than 77 °C (Kluge et al., 2015) is limited to the mineral calcite, though there is one unpublished calibration data set involving dolomites in the 50–350 °C range (Bonifacie et al., 2011).

In addition to a paucity of data for dolomite, the published calibration results for calcite diverge. Many of the early applications of the \( \Delta_{47} \) paleothermometer involved data that were generated within a single laboratory (Caltech), which is where the initial \( \Delta_{47} \) to temperature calibration was derived (Ghosh et al., 2006a). This calibration, which used synthetic carbonates that precipitated at known temperatures, revealed a relationship between temperature and \( \Delta_{47} \) that exhibited greater temperature sensitivity than the theoretical (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009). It was unclear whether this mismatch arose from uncertainties in theoretical calculations, fractionation during acid digestion, and/or other factors (Dennis et al., 2011). In the years since the publication of the initial calibration, multiple groups have established clumped isotope laboratories, and they have conducted new calibration experiments using a variety of carbonate types and using an assortment of laboratory protocols (Ghosh et al., 2007; Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Tripati et al., 2010; Thiagarajan et al., 2011; Saenger et al., 2012; Eagle et al., 2013a; Grauel et al., 2013; Henkes et al., 2013; Zaarur et al., 2013; Fernandez et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2014; Came et al., 2014; Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015; Kluge et al., 2015). This has resulted in multiple discrepant calibration equations, and has made it difficult to determine whether the discrepant calibrations result from differences in laboratory protocols (e.g. Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015), from actual differences in the \( \Delta_{47} \) to temperature relationships of various types of carbonates (i.e., kinetic isotope effects as discussed in Hill et al., 2014a; Tripati et al., 2015), or cation substitution (per Hill et al., 2014b; Yuan, 2015). One striking observation, however, is that there appear to be two main clusters of calibrations: one cluster that resembles the equation initially derived by the group at Caltech (Ghosh et al., 2006a, 2007; Tripati et al., 2010, 2015; Thiagarajan et al., 2011; Grauel et al., 2013; Zaarur et al., 2013; Came et al., 2014; Kimball et al., 2015); and another cluster that resembles an equation derived by the group at Harvard (Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Tang et al., 2014; Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015; Kluge et al., 2015). The establishment of a common interlaboratory “absolute reference frame” for reporting \( \Delta_{47} \) (Dennis et al., 2011) has not brought the discrepant calibrations into agreement. Notably, both types of calibrations have been reported based on measurements of samples precipitated at <50 °C using different methods, made on the same instrument and reacted for analysis using the same digestion apparatus (Tang et al., 2014; Tripati et al., 2015). In addition, both types of calibrations have been observed in deep-sea coral of variable mineralogy, also measured on the same system (Kimball et al., 2015). One way to investigate the reason(s) for the discrepancies is to obtain \( \Delta_{47} \) calibration data for samples that grew at high temperatures, where extrapolations of the published equations diverge substantially. Until recently, no comprehensive calibration study had been published for calcites that precipitated at temperatures greater than 77 °C. The recent results of Kluge et al. (2015), however, extend the empirical calibration to include calcites that precipitated at temperatures of up to 250 °C, and the results of carbonate mineral heating experiments (Ghosh et al., 2006a; Guo et al., 2009; Passey and Henkes, 2012; Henkes et al., 2014; Stolper and Eiler, 2015; Tripati et al., 2015) produce “anchors” at still higher temperatures (475 to >1000 °C). Some of these studies (Passey and Henkes, 2012; Kluge et al., 2015; Stolper and Eiler, 2015) provide improved constraints on the slope of the inorganic calcite calibration equation, and confirm earlier results (Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Tang et al., 2014; Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015) suggesting that calcites reacted in phosphoric acid at high temperature (70–90 °C) yield a calibration equation with a slope that is similar to the slope predicted by theory (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009). Furthermore, these high temperature studies (Passey and Henkes, 2012; Kluge et al., 2015; Stolper and Eiler, 2015) provide empirical validation for the approach of other authors (Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Ferry et al., 2011; Huntington et al., 2011; Bristow et al., 2011; Budd et al., 2013; Dale et al., 2014; Henkes et al., 2014; Shenton et al., 2015) who used the theoretical equations (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009) for their reconstructions of burial and diagenetic histories.
The lack of data for dolomite, and the uncertainty over calibrations, particularly at high temperatures, motivated the present study. Specifically, we aim to validate the application of this geothermometer to dolomites grown at high temperatures (~73 to 176 °C) using geological samples, analogous to the taxon specific biogenic calibrations that have been published for temperatures ranging from 0 to 30 °C (e.g., Eagle et al., 2010; Tripathi et al., 2010; Thirarajan et al., 2011; Grauel et al., 2013; Came et al., 2014). We compare new Δ47 results from dolomite cements to precipitation temperatures that were determined independently using fluid inclusion microthermometry (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Fluid inclusions are tiny fluid-filled vacuoles within minerals that retain remnants of the fluid from which the enclosing mineral precipitated, and record the temperature at which that enclosing phase grew (Shepherd et al., 1985; Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994; Goldstein, 2003). Although there are uncertainties associated with the interpretation of fluid inclusion temperatures, they are subject to different sources of uncertainty than clumped isotope thermometry and may be subject to fewer sources of error. The Δ47 measurements presented here were performed on materials that were microdrilled from the same spots where fluid inclusion temperatures were measured. We compare our rock-based dolomite “calibration” to published theoretical and empirical results, and show that our new data are broadly consistent with a range of published calibrations, confirming the utility of the clumped isotope technique when applied to dolomites from high temperature shallow crustal environments.

2. GEOLOGIC SETTING AND LITHOSTRATIGRAPHY

Samples were collected from the Boat Harbour, Catoche, and Aguathuna formations of the Lower Ordovician St. George Group of western Newfoundland, Canada (Fig. 1). The rocks of the St. George Group consist of tropical, shallow water carbonates that were deposited on a wide, peritidal carbonate ramp (James et al., 1989). Sedimentation of these shallow marine carbonates began during the Middle to Late Cambrian when high-energy carbonates of the Port-au-Port Group were deposited. These were succeeded by Early to earliest Middle Ordovician low-energy carbonates of the St. George Group (cf. Knight et al., 2008). Taconic fore-arc forcing resulted in distal lithospheric upwarping and rapid sweeping of a tectonic peripheral bulge on the margin, which led to compression, block faulting, uplift, and erosion of the St. George carbonate platform and development of the regional St. George Unconformity (Mussman and Read, 1986; Knight et al., 2008) (Fig. 2A). A subsequent, tectonically driven local...
sea level rise accommodated deposition of the superjacent deepening-upward carbonates of the Table Head Group (Stenzel et al., 1990; Knight et al., 2008).

Lower Paleozoic successions deposited on the Laurentia shallow marine platform margin are characterized by a thick Middle Cambrian to lower Middle Ordovician carbonate bank. Lithostratigraphy of the St. George Group has been discussed in detail and refined in multiple studies (e.g. Pratt and James, 1986; Knight and James, 1987; Knight et al., 2008). The lithostratigraphic framework (Fig. 2A) is briefly summarized here. The St. George Group consists of early Ordovician ( Tremadoc-Arenig) platform carbonates (500 m thick), which from bottom to top include the Watts Bight, Boat Harbour, Catoche, and Aguathuna formations (Fig. 2A). The upper boundary of the St. George Group (Aguathuna/Table Point formational contact) is marked by the major regional St. George Group Unconformity (SGU; Fig. 2A). The St. George Group can be divided into two sedimentary megacycles separated by the Boat Harbour Disconformity (BHD; Fig. 2A). Each megacycle is characterized by a large-scale transgressive-regressive succession that resulted in stacking of lower peritidal, middle subtidal and upper peritidal units (Knight and James, 1987; Knight et al., 2008). Multiple stages of dolomitization affected the St. George Group carbonates (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014).

3. PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED WORK ON THE ST. GEORGE GROUP SAMPLES

3.1. Petrographic results

The dolomite samples investigated in the present work (Table 1) have been studied extensively by previous authors (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Mineral Phase</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>1σ</th>
<th>δ18Oc (‰)</th>
<th>δ18Ow (‰)</th>
<th>δ18Od (‰)</th>
<th>δ13C (‰)</th>
<th>dTh/C176 (‰)</th>
<th>Δ176/C0 (‰)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>SEa (‰)</th>
<th>SEo (‰)</th>
<th>SE (‰)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>SEa (‰)</th>
<th>SEo (‰)</th>
<th>SE (‰)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>SEa (‰)</th>
<th>SEo (‰)</th>
<th>SE (‰)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-86.5D3</td>
<td>Catoche</td>
<td>Very coarse saddle dolomite</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-138D2B</td>
<td>Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Zoned med. coarse dolomite</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-184D2B</td>
<td>Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Zoned med. coarse dolomite</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-116-D2</td>
<td>Aguathuna</td>
<td>Dolomite</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P92-D1</td>
<td>Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Th is previously published homogenization temperature based on fluid-inclusion microthermometry (Azmy et al., 2008; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). No δ18O values were obtained for D1 dolomicrites because inclusions were too small, though formation temperatures are reported to be less than 50°C (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Fluid inclusions are tiny vacuoles (∼7 to 10 μm) that retain remnants of the fluid from which the dolomite precipitated. Because the integrity of a primary two-phase fluid inclusion remains intact over geologic time, the Th of that inclusion reflects the temperature at which the enclosing mineral phase precipitated (Shepherd et al., 1985; Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994; Goldstein, 2003). The Δ176 measurements presented in the current study were performed on materials that were microdrilled from the same spots where Th values were measured. Previous work (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014) indicates that the inclusions in our selected suites are primary: they occur parallel to crystal facets and have a consistent liquid: vapor ratio (e.g., Goldstein, 2003). Furthermore, the Th values of each selected suite of primary fluid inclusions vary within 15°C (Table 1), confirming their primary nature (Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994; Goldstein, 2003).

The measured Th values of the St. George Group dolomites are similar to the range of temperatures (∼75 to 160°C) concluded from burial history studies (Cooper et al., 2001), conodont alteration index (CAI), acritarch alteration indices (AAI), and graptolite reflectance from the Lower Ordovician rocks of western Newfoundland (Nowlan and Barnes, 1987; Williams et al., 1998). No measurements were obtained for D1 dolomicrites because inclusions were too small, though the fabric-retentive textures and near-micritic grain sizes suggest formation at near-surface conditions with temperatures below ∼50°C (Olanipekun et al., 2014; cf. Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994).
3.3. Parent fluids results

Previous work involving petrography, trace/minor element geochemistry, stable isotope geochemistry, fluid inclusion microthermometry, and fluid inclusion halide geochemistry indicates that the D1, D2 and D3 dolomites of the St. George Group originated from parent diagenetic fluids that reflect progressively deeper burial environments (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Conliffe et al., 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). These parameters indicate that the D1 dolomites (dolomicroites) precipitated at near-surface conditions, from dolomitizing fluids with oxygen isotopic signatures (approx. −8.1‰ to −5.8‰) and Sr/Ca molar ratios (<0.008) indicative of a mixture of seawater and meteoric waters (Azmy et al., 2009; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Thus, it is likely that D1 dolomicroites formed by dolomitization of micritic lime mudstones during very early stages of diagenesis by mixed waters (likely marine and meteoric). The micritic to near-micritic grain size and absence of two-phase fluid inclusions are consistent with dolomitization being driven by replacement at low-temperatures by these mixed fluids.

The D2 and D3 dolomites precipitated in hotter burial settings. After dolomitization turned C1 micrites into D1 dolomicroites, it is argued that in some cases, in a mid-burial setting, hotter fluids (>60 °C) recrystallized D1 into D2, resulting in increased crystal size and the development of primary two-phase fluid inclusions. D3 dolomites precipitated in a deeper environment than D2 dolomites (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azomani et al., 2013; Conliffe et al., 2010). The halide geochemistry of the entrapped fluids in these phases suggests that the dolomitizing fluids originated from slightly evaporated seawater that may have been partially diluted by meteoric waters (Conliffe et al., 2010; Conliffe et al., 2012).

4. METHODS

No new microthermometric measurements were performed as part of the current study, but results from previous investigations were utilized. In summary, the previously published Td measurements were performed using a state-of-the-art Linkam THMSG600 heating-freezing stage calibrated with synthetic fluid inclusion standards at temperatures between −56.6 °C and 374.1 °C. Precision on individual Td measurements was better than ±1 °C (e.g., Olanipekun et al., 2014). Homogenization temperatures were recorded first in order to minimize the effects of stretching in relatively soft minerals following procedures outlined by Shepherd et al. (1985).

The isotopic analyses conducted as part of the present study were performed using the same samples that were used to generate the previously published Td data. All dolomite samples were analyzed blindly in the Tripati Laboratory at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA), following procedures described elsewhere (Affek and Eiler, 2006; Huntington et al., 2009; Passey et al., 2010; Loyd et al., 2013). Analyses were performed using an automated carbonate device (e.g., Passey et al., 2010) coupled with a Thermo-Finnigan MAT253 gas-source isotope ratio mass spectrometer configured to collect masses 44–49. Each analysis consisted of an ~8 mg aliquot of dolomite sample powder, which was digested for 20 min in 105% H3PO4 at 90 °C (density = 1.92 g/mL), with acid being changed every 8–10 sample analyses or more frequently if the color changed, if the reaction vessel appeared dirty, or if the magnet was not rotating. Acid density was checked when a new bottle was first opened, when it was 1/3 full, and when it was nearly empty. Water and other contaminating phases were removed from the product CO2 using a dry ice and ethanol slush. Any additional contaminating phases, such as hydrocarbons, were removed by passing sample CO2 through a gas chromatograph column (Porapak Q 120/80 mesh, 122 cm long, 2.15 mm ID) at −30 °C, and by passing the sample through a silver foil trap. Each analysis consisted of 8 acquisitions, each of which consisted of 8 cycles of back-and-forth sample to reference gas comparisons (reference gas δ18OVSMOW = 25.06‰; δ18OVPDB = −3.61‰), for a total of 64 cycles per analysis. The 18O correction of Santrock et al. (1985) was applied. Data for 34 analyses are reported.

In order to account for mass spectrometric nonlinearities and for scale compression associated with ion source chemistry, raw Δ47 values were normalized using a suite of 25 and 1000 °C equilibrated gases of various bulk isotopic compositions. Data are reported in the absolute reference frame that was calculated using these equilibrated gases, with equilibrated gas slopes and transfer functions provided in Supplemental Table 1. All Δ47 data are reported in a manner consistent with a 25 °C reaction temperature by the application of an acid digestion correction of 0.082‰ to convert from 90 to 25 °C (Defliese et al., 2015). This correction is statistically indistinguishable from the 0.092‰ correction reported by Henkes et al. (2013) and the corrections summarized by Wacker et al. (2015), and it is applicable for both dolomite and calcite (Defliese et al., 2015). We note that an alternative acid digestion fractionation factor of 0.153‰ has recently been published by Murray et al. (2016).

For the calculation of the stable oxygen isotope values of dolomite (δ18Oaq), we applied a fractionation factor of 1.0093 (Rosenbaum and Sheppard, 1986) to account for the temperature-dependent fractionation of oxygen isotopes between dolomite and CO2 gas that results from the reaction with phosphoric acid at 90 °C. The oxygen isotopic compositions of parent fluids (δ18Ow) were calculated using δ18Oaq, the previously published Td values, and the equation of Horita (2014).

Long-term reproducibility of a Carrera Marble standard in the Tripati laboratory is better than 0.1‰ (1σ) for δ18Oaq and δ13C before standardization and better than 0.01‰ after standardization. The long-term average Δ47 value of the internal Carrara Marble (CM) standard is 0.386 ± 0.002‰ (s.e., n = 72; 1σ = 0.017). Values for internal CM standards reported in Dennis et al. (2011) include 0.392 ± 0.007‰ (n = 18) for Caltech, 0.385 ± 0.005‰ (n = 40) for Harvard, 0.403 ± 0.006‰ (n = 8) for Johns Hopkins, and 0.400 ± 0.004‰ for Yale (n = 49). Note that these are analyses on separate blocks of CM and therefore there may be some heterogeneity in primary values between...
5. RESULTS

All $\delta^{18}O$ and $\Delta_{47}$ data generated as part of this study are provided in Supplemental Table 1. Mean $\delta^{18}O_a$ and $\Delta_{47}$, as well as the calculated $\delta^{18}O_{w}$, are presented in Table 1.

5.1. Oxygen isotope results

Oxygen isotopic compositions of the dolomite cements $(\delta^{18}O_d)$ range from $-12.5\%e$ to $-6.4\%e$ (Table 1; Fig. 3A), in agreement with published $\delta^{18}O$ results from these same formations (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Conliffe et al., 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). The decrease in $\delta^{18}O_d$ with increasing $T_h$ is consistent with petrographic results that indicate progressively deeper burial of the St. George Group sediments: initial precipitation (D1) occurred at low temperatures at near surface conditions; and subsequent precipitation (D2 and D3) occurred at higher temperatures in deeper burial environments (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Conliffe et al., 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014).

The calculated $\delta^{18}O$ values of diagenetic waters (18O$_{w}$) in equilibrium with the dolomites for each $T_h$ and $\delta^{18}O_d$ pair range from $-3.2\%e$ to $6.8\%e$ (Table 1; Fig. 3B). As with $\delta^{18}O_a$, the $\delta^{18}O_{w}$ results agree with published results from these same formations (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Conliffe et al., 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Our calculated $\delta^{18}O_{w}$ values for D1 dolomites ($-3.1\%e$ and $-3.2\%e$) are higher than the range reported previously (approx. $-8.1\%e$ to $-5.8\%e$; Azmy et al., 2009; Olanipekun et al., 2014), but they overlap with the published range when error is considered (Fig. 3B). Higher $\delta^{18}O_{w}$ values (1.1%e to 6.8%e) for the D2 and D3 dolomites are consistent with previous interpretations that these phases precipitated in deeper burial settings from high temperature brines that mixed with dilute fluids, such as meteoric waters (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azomani et al., 2013; Conliffe et al., 2010, 2012).

5.2. Clumped isotope results

The mean $\Delta_{47}$ values of the samples in our suite range from 0.437‰ to 0.532‰ (Table 1; Fig. 4). These values are all low relative to the $\Delta_{47}$ of carbonates that record typical Earth surface temperatures (e.g., Zaarur et al., 2011; Henkes et al., 2013; Wacker et al., 2014; many others), and are consistent with diagenetic temperatures. In general, the $\Delta_{47}$ values of the St. George Group samples decrease with progressively higher $T_h$ (Fig. 4).

Fig. 4 suggests that the clumped isotope signatures of some of the samples in our suite were reordered to lower values than expected based on their fluid inclusion temperatures (See Section 6.1 below for the discussion of reordering). The $\Delta_{47}$ values of the two D1 samples from the Boat Harbour formation (0.514 ± 0.010‰e and 0.530 ± 0.010‰e) are statistically indistinguishable from the $\Delta_{47}$ of the three D2 samples from that same formation (0.509 ± 0.003‰e and 0.490 ± 0.004‰e, and 0.532 ± 0.012‰e) despite the very different fluid inclusion temperatures for those phases (for both D1 samples $T_h < 50 \degree$C; for D2, $T_h = 121.3 \pm 9.4 \degree$C, 121.3 ± 9.4 \degree C, and 103.1 ± 6.2 \degree C). Similarly, the $\Delta_{47}$ of the D2 sample from the Catoche formation (0.456 ± 0.007‰e) is within error of the $\Delta_{47}$ of the D3 sample from that same formation (0.445 ± 0.012‰e), though the fluid inclusion temperatures of those phases are 123.6 ± 1.0 °C and 175.9 ± 7.3 °C respectively. Only one sample from the Aguathuna formation was analyzed, precluding a similar comparison for that formation.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1. Possible modification of initial $T_h$ and/or $\Delta_{47}$ signatures

6.1.1. Primary nature of fluid inclusions

We consider the possibility that the initial $T_h$ signatures of the St. George Group samples were altered by geologic processes that occurred after the formation of the dolomites and the entrapment of the fluid inclusions. As described in Section 3.2 above, fluid inclusions retain remnants of the fluid from which the enclosing mineral phase precipitated, and the measured $T_h$ of that inclusion reflects the temperature of precipitation, assuming that no subsequent re-equilibration of the fluid inclusion occurred (Shepherd et al., 1985; Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994; Goldstein, 2003). Re-equilibration occurs if the inclusion volume changes, or if anything is added to or lost from the inclusion following entrapment (Bodnar, 2003b).

In order to assess the likelihood of re-equilibration of the fluid inclusions, the St. George Group samples were examined comprehensively using conventional optical microscopy, cathodoluminescence, and fluid inclusion assemblages (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Optical microscopy and cathodoluminescence provide diagnostic evidence about re-equilibration of a fluid inclusion because the deformation caused by re-equilibration leads to distinctive textural changes in mineral host phases (Goldstein, 2003). Fluid inclusion assemblages provide further evidence because individual two-phase (liquid + vapor) fluid inclusions within a fluid inclusion assemblage should have consistent liquid: vapor ratios if no re-equilibration has occurred, as is well established in the field of fluid inclusion microthermometry (e.g., Goldstein, 2003). Finally, if no re-equilibration has occurred, the $T_h$ values within a suite of fluid inclusions should not vary widely. The results of previous studies involving the St. George Group samples yield no evidence that re-equilibration of the fluid inclusions occurred (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014). Furthermore, the $T_h$ values within each of our selected suites of primary fluid inclusions vary within <15 °C (Table 1), which confirms their primary nature (Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994; Goldstein, 2003).
6.1.2. Solid-state clumped isotope exchange reactions

The $\Delta_{47}$ values presented in this study were generated using the same dolomite samples from which the fluid inclusion temperatures were previously obtained. Therefore, if no re-equilibration of the fluid inclusions occurred after precipitation, then the fluid inclusion temperature and the $\Delta_{47}$-derived temperature of a given dolomite sample should be equal unless $\Delta_{47}$ was modified after mineral growth. As of this date, no comprehensive $\Delta_{47}$ to temperature calibration for dolomites has been published, so it is not possible to compare $T_h$ values to $\Delta_{47}$-derived temperatures using an existing empirical calibration. However, unpublished calibration data from natural and synthetic dolomites grown at known temperatures from 25 to 350 °C (Bonifacie et al., 2011) have been shown to resemble the Guo et al. (2009) theoretical temperature dependence for calcite. Furthermore, the limited dolomite calibration data of Ferry et al. (2011; two data points from <45 °C) support this notion. Therefore, we follow the lead of previous authors (e.g. Bristow et al., 2011; Ferry et al., 2011; Budd et al., 2013; Dale et al., 2014; Shenton et al., 2015) and tentatively assume that the $\Delta_{47}$ to temperature dependence for

### Table 2

Standard values for the runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>$\delta^{13}$C (PDB; ‰)</th>
<th>$\delta^{18}$O calcite (PDB; ‰)</th>
<th>$\delta^{18}$O</th>
<th>$\Delta_{47}$</th>
<th>$\Delta_{47}$</th>
<th>$\Delta_{47}$</th>
<th>$\Delta_{47}$</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk</td>
<td>2.292 0.012</td>
<td>-4.335 0.027</td>
<td>0.694 0.045</td>
<td>0.704 0.021</td>
<td>0.035 0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk</td>
<td>2.216 0.006</td>
<td>-4.289 0.014</td>
<td>0.702 0.012</td>
<td>0.712 0.018</td>
<td>0.018 0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk E10</td>
<td>2.229 0.006</td>
<td>-4.332 0.011</td>
<td>0.650 0.060</td>
<td>0.660 0.044</td>
<td>0.044 0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk E11</td>
<td>2.263 0.002</td>
<td>-4.318 0.009</td>
<td>0.691 0.070</td>
<td>0.701 0.059</td>
<td>0.059 0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk E12</td>
<td>2.274 0.003</td>
<td>-4.278 0.016</td>
<td>0.649 0.659</td>
<td>0.659 0.041</td>
<td>0.041 0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk E9</td>
<td>2.312 0.003</td>
<td>-4.194 0.013</td>
<td>0.676 0.686</td>
<td>0.686 0.034</td>
<td>0.034 0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Chalk G4</td>
<td>2.196 0.004</td>
<td>-4.299 0.012</td>
<td>0.663 0.673</td>
<td>0.673 0.040</td>
<td>0.040 0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrara Marble D12</td>
<td>2.164 0.008</td>
<td>-2.050 0.022</td>
<td>0.391 0.401</td>
<td>0.401 0.038</td>
<td>0.038 0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrara Marble D8</td>
<td>2.131 0.005</td>
<td>-2.073 0.015</td>
<td>0.397 0.407</td>
<td>0.407 0.059</td>
<td>0.059 0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrara Marble G2</td>
<td>2.161 0.006</td>
<td>-1.960 0.015</td>
<td>0.408 0.418</td>
<td>0.418 0.036</td>
<td>0.036 0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrara Marble G5</td>
<td>2.151 0.006</td>
<td>-1.953 0.019</td>
<td>0.397 0.407</td>
<td>0.407 0.033</td>
<td>0.033 0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH-2</td>
<td>-10.172 0.004</td>
<td>-18.912 0.016</td>
<td>0.295 0.305</td>
<td>0.305 0.044</td>
<td>0.044 0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH-3 B11</td>
<td>1.634 0.004</td>
<td>-2.147 0.016</td>
<td>0.682 0.692</td>
<td>0.692 0.034</td>
<td>0.034 0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An acid fractionation correction of +0.082‰ was applied (Defliese et al., 2015).
* An acid fractionation correction of +0.092‰ was applied (Henkes et al., 2013).

---

Fig. 3. Previously published fluid inclusion temperatures ($T_h$) of dolomite cements (Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Conliffe et al., 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014) and newly acquired oxygen isotopic measurements. (A) Mean $\delta^{18}$O (PDB) plotted versus $T_h$; (B) calculated $\delta^{18}$O (SMOW) versus $T_h$. The $\delta^{18}$O values were calculated using $\delta^{18}$O, the previously published $T_h$ values, and the equation of Horita (2014). Contours of $\delta^{18}$O are derived from a published calibration for dolomite (Horita, 2014). Error bars in (A) represent 1 standard deviation on $T_h$ and $\delta^{18}$O. Shaded error spaces in (B) represent the 1σ range of possible $T_h$ values and the 1σ uncertainty in $\delta^{18}$O propagated through the calibration equation. Open circles represent D1; “x" symbols represent D2; filled diamonds represent D3. Black symbols represent data from the Boat Harbour formation; green symbols represent data from the Catoche formation; red symbols represent data from the Aguathuna formation. The 50 °C values for D1 samples represent maximum temperatures (see Section 3.2). (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
dolomite resembles the theoretical relationship for calcite. The clumped isotope temperatures that our $\delta^{47}_{D}$ values imply based on the theoretical temperature dependence for calcite (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009) are provided in Table 3.

Comparison of our results to the theoretical relationship (Fig. 4; Table 3) indicates that the $\delta^{47}_{D}$ signatures of some (or perhaps all) of the St. George Group samples were modified after mineral growth by thermally activated solid-state isotope exchange reactions (e.g. Passey and Henkes, 2012; Henkes et al., 2014; Stolper and Eiler, 2015). We also note that it is not necessary to know the relationship between temperature and the $\delta^{47}_{D}$ of dolomite in order to make this inference. The D1 dolomites from Boat Harbour precipitated during an early stage of diagenesis in a near-surface to shallow burial environment (as indicated by relative fabric preservation, near micritic crystal size, and dull CL response), yet they have $\delta^{47}_{D}$ signatures ($\approx 0.52\%$) that are similar to the values for the later-forming D2 dolomites from that same formation ($\approx 0.51\%$), which precipitated later, and in deeper and hotter environments ($\approx 115^\circ C$).

Similarly, the D2 dolomite from the Catoche formation resembles the theoretical relationship for calcite. The clumped isotope temperatures that our $\delta^{47}_{D}$ values imply based on the theoretical temperature dependence for calcite (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009) are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Formation temperatures predicted using previously published calibration equations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Formation Phase</th>
<th>$T_{h}$ (°C)</th>
<th>$\sigma$ (°C)</th>
<th>Temperature Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D1 Dolomite</td>
<td>175.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.514 ± 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P81-D1 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.508 ± 0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P92-D1 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.486 ± 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D2 Zoned med. coarse dolomite</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-116-D2D2B-R Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1-116-D2D2B-Aguathuna</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.486 ± 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D3 Very coarse sard dolomite</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.514 ± 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P184-D3 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.508 ± 0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P92-D1 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>Dolomicrite</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.486 ± 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D4 Very coarse sard dolomite</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D4 Very coarse sard dolomite</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D4 Zoned med. coarse dolomite</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Boat Harbour</td>
<td>D4 Zoned med. coarse dolomite</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.490 ± 0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The temperature estimates of Defliese et al. (2015) and Zaarur et al. (2013) are based on extrapolations of their published equations. No $T_{h}$ values were obtained for D1 dolomicrites because inclusions were too small, though formation temperatures are reported to be less than 50°C (Zaarur et al., 2013). Olanipekun et al. (2014).
has a $\Delta_47$ signature (0.456‰) that is similar to the signature of the later- and deeper-forming (hotter) D3 sample (0.445‰) from that same formation. Furthermore, the D2 dolomite from the Aguathuna formation has a $\Delta_47$ signature (0.486‰) that is lower than that of the D2 dolomites from Boat Harbour (~0.51‰), yet the Boat Harbour samples precipitated at temperatures that were 40 to 50 °C hotter. Dissolution and recrystallization are unlikely explanations for these observations because the suites of fluid inclusions within each of these D2 phases retained their primary nature (Section 6.1.1). Therefore, we conclude that the $\Delta_47$ signatures of these samples must have been modified by solid-state isotope exchange reactions.

On the other hand, the clumped isotope signatures of a subset of the St. George Group dolomites appear to have remained unmodified. For example, the $\Delta_47$ of the D2 Boat Harbour samples agree fairly well with the theoretical predictions (Fig. 4; Fig. 5). This suggests that these samples may not have experienced detectable solid-state isotope exchange, as solid-state reordering in these samples would imply initial $\Delta_47$ signatures that were greater than those predicted by any clumped isotope calibration to date.

Modification after mineral growth of the $\Delta_47$ signatures of the St. George Group dolomites by solid-state isotope exchange reactions is an unexpected result in light of recent work that predicts no detectable reordering in dolomites held at temperatures less than ~250 °C over timescales of up to $10^7$ years (Lloyd and Eiler, 2014), and also in light of previous work suggesting a dolomite blocking temperature in a slowly cooled system of ~300 °C (Eiler, 2011; Ferry et al., 2011). $T_b$ values from the St. George Group fluid inclusions, which record the temperatures of dolomitizing fluids, do not exceed 200 °C (Table 1), and previously published burial history studies - which include data from conodont alteration index, acritarch alteration indices, and graptolite reflectance - suggest that the Lower Ordovician rocks of western Newfoundland were not exposed to burial temperatures in excess of 160 °C (Nowlan and Barnes, 1987; Williams et al., 1998; Cooper et al., 2001). Therefore, it is difficult to reconcile our new results with previous estimates of the dolomite blocking temperature (Eiler, 2011; Ferry et al., 2011; Lloyd and Eiler, 2014).

One possible explanation for this disagreement is that the susceptibility of the mineral dolomite to thermally activated solid-state isotope exchange may be greater than estimated by previous authors (Eiler, 2011; Ferry et al., 2011; Lloyd and Eiler, 2014). Kinetic models involving the mineral calcite (e.g., Passey and Henkes, 2012; Henkes et al., 2014; Stolper and Eiler, 2015) predict that detectable solid-state reordering in that mineral can occur at temperatures above ~115 °C on timescales of $10^7$–$10^8$ years, and that complete re-equilibration can occur at temperatures greater than 200 °C in most geological environments (Henkes et al., 2014). Furthermore, recent work involving laboratory shearing experiments suggests that calcite may be susceptible to reordering in high stress environments (Siman-Tov et al., 2016). If the susceptibility of the mineral dolomite were more akin to that of calcite, then the initial $\Delta_47$ signatures of the earlier forming dolomite phases may have been reordered due to the documented heating of the St. George Group. Reordering without recrystallization leaves no physical evidence that the inferred $\Delta_47$ temperature is disconnected from crystallization temperature, though it could potentially be detected by examining trends with burial depth if sufficient data exist, by assessing the relationship between $\Delta_47$ and other geochemical parameters (e.g., Loyd et al., 2015), or possibly by using imaging techniques such as electron backscatter diffraction (Henkes et al., 2014). These types of analyses could potentially be targeted in future studies.

A second possible explanation for the disagreement is that previously published burial history studies (Nowlan and Barnes, 1987; Williams et al., 1998; Cooper et al., 2001) may have underestimated the maximum burial temperatures to which the St George Group dolomites were exposed. However, because of their potential as hydrocarbon reservoirs, the Lower Ordovician rocks of western Newfoundland have been studied extensively (e.g., Nowlan and Barnes, 1987; Williams et al., 1998; Cooper et al., 2001; Azmy et al., 2008, 2009; Azmy and Conliffe, 2010; Azomani et al., 2013; Olanipekun et al., 2014; many others), and previously published burial history investigations include results from conodont alter-
ations, but repeated detectable re-equilibration occurred in the measured inclusion phase precipitated. It is conceivable that some undetectable, which could possibly be tested using novel approaches that can identify small-scale structural or chemical changes, such as high-resolution techniques (e.g., synchrotron, atom probe, secondary ion mass spectrometry, electron probe mapping). Nonetheless, if recrystallization of the D1 Boat Harbour samples did occur at temperatures in excess of ~100 °C (see Table 3 for temperatures predicted by various calibration equations) then it would appear that it did not impact these petrographic features. In the case of the D2 Aguathuna sample, the fluid inclusions were primary, as described in Section 6.1.1 above, and should therefore reflect the temperature at which the enclosing mineral formation. In the case of the D1 Boat Harbour samples, the fabric-retentive textures (e.g., algal lamination), near-micritic grain sizes (Fig. 2B), and insignificant recrystallization provide potential evidence that they formed at near-surface conditions of temperatures below 50 °C (Oalanpekun et al., 2014; cf. Goldstein and Reynolds, 1994). A caveat is that recrystallization can occur on an atom by atom scale and thus be fabric retentive, which could possibly be tested using novel approaches that can identify small-scale structural or chemical changes, such as high-resolution techniques (e.g., synchrotron, atom probe, secondary ion mass spectrometry, electron probe mapping). Nonetheless, if recrystallization of the D1 Boat Harbour samples did occur at temperatures in excess of ~100 °C (see Table 3 for temperatures predicted by various calibration equations) then it would appear that it did not impact these petrographic features. In the case of the D2 Aguathuna sample, the fluid inclusions were primary, as described in Section 6.1.1 above, and should therefore reflect the temperature at which the enclosing mineral phase precipitated. It is conceivable that some undetectable re-equilibration occurred in the measured inclusions, but repeated measurements from the Aguathuna formation and D2 dolomites from throughout the Aguathuna formation provide very consistent results ($T_h = 73.2 ± 3.5$ °C; Table 1), which suggests that re-equilibration is unlikely.

### 6.2. The $\Delta\varepsilon$-to-temperature relationship in the St. George Group dolomites

In the discussion that follows, only $\Delta\varepsilon$ data from samples that did not exhibit obvious evidence of modification as described in Section 6.1.2 above are included (i.e. D1 dolomites from Boat Harbour, D2 dolomites from Aguathuna, and D2 dolomites from Catoche are not included). We stress, however, that any or all of the samples in our suite may have experienced some degree of solid-state reordering, in which case the $\Delta\varepsilon$ at the time of precipitation and entrapment of the fluid inclusions would have been greater than our measured $\Delta\varepsilon$. Therefore, the relationship between temperature and $\Delta\varepsilon$ presented here should not be considered a true “calibration.”

A linear least squares regression of the $\Delta\varepsilon$ values of the St. George Group dolomites plotted vs. $10^6/T^2$ (where $T$ is $T_h$ expressed in Kelvin) yields:

$$\Delta\varepsilon = (0.0434 ± 0.0510) * 10^6/T^2 + (0.2086 ± 0.3161)$$

$$n = 6; R^2 = 0.58; SE_{\text{ext}} = 0.0286; 95\%\text{(CI)}.$$  

where $\Delta\varepsilon$ is expressed in the absolute reference frame of Dennis et al. (2011).

### 6.3. Possible implications for discrepant calibrations

As described in Section 1, many of the previously published $\Delta\varepsilon$-to-temperature relationships lie in one of two main clusters: one cluster that resembles the equation initially derived by the group at Caltech (Ghosh et al., 2006a, 2007; Tripati et al., 2010, 2015; Thiagarajan et al., 2011; Grauel et al., 2013; Zaarur et al., 2013; Came et al., 2014; Kimball et al., 2015); and a second cluster that resembles an equation derived by the group at Harvard (Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Tang et al., 2014; Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015; Kimball et al., 2015; Kluge et al., 2015). Several possible explanations for these apparent calibration differences have been explored, such as the acid digestion fractionation factor (Defliese et al., 2015), sample size (Wacker et al., 2013), a sensitivity of phosphoric acid fractionation to the bulk or clumped isotopic compositions of carbonates (Wacker et al., 2014), differences in the procedures utilized by laboratories (e.g., Henkes et al., 2013; Came et al., 2014; Fernandez et al., 2014; Wacker et al., 2014; Defliese et al., 2015), kinetic isotope effects (Hill et al., 2014a; Tripati et al., 2015), and/or the substitution of different cations in the mineral lattice (Hill et al., 2014b; Yuan, 2015). Confidently determining the nature of the origin of these discrepancies is beyond the scope of the present work. However, because the various calibration equations diverge at high temperatures (see Fig. 6), calibration data from samples that precipitated in relatively high temperature environments (~73 to 176 °C) may contribute to our understanding of these issues.

Fig. 6A provides a comparison of the $\Delta\varepsilon$ results from the St. George Group dolomites to several published empirical calibrations, which for consistency, are all presented in the absolute reference frame (ARF; Dennis et al., 2011) and converted to 25 °C using the acid fractionation factors of Defliese et al. (2015), assuming no mineral-specific differences. For the sake of clarity, only a select subset of the published $\Delta\varepsilon$ to temperature relationships are included in Fig. 6A: (1) a compilation of calibration data from high temperature acid digestions (Defliese et al., 2015); (2) a compilation of calibration data from 25 °C acid digestions (Zaarur et al., 2013); (3) a single comprehensive calibration study that includes calibration samples that precipitated in high temperature environments (25 to 250 °C; Kluge et al., 2015); (4) a theoretical equation for calcite (Schauble et al., 2006) incorporating an intercept of 0.268 (Guo et al., 2009); (5) a second theoretical equation for calcite (Hill et al., 2014a) also incorporating an intercept of 0.268 (Guo et al., 2009); and (6) several high temperature (475 to 1550 °C) data points that were generated using calcites from laboratory heating experiments (Ghosh et al., 2006a; Guo et al., 2009; Passey and Henkes, 2012; Stolper and
Fig. 6. A comparison of Δ47 data from dolomites (this study) to published calcite calibrations. (A) Data corrected using the phosphoric acid fractionation factor of Defliese et al. (2015). The dotted purple line represents the theoretical calcite relationship of Schauble et al. (2006) with the intercept of Guo et al. (2009) transferred to the absolute reference frame using the transfer function of Dennis et al. (2011). The solid purple line represents the theoretical calcite relationship of Hill et al. (2014a) with the intercept of Guo et al. (2009) transferred to the absolute reference frame using the transfer function of Dennis et al. (2011). The green line represents the calibration of Defliese et al. (2015), which includes calibration data from their study as well as calibration data from previous studies. Data included in the Defliese et al. (2015) compilation are: Eagle et al. (2010), Dennis and Schrag (2010), Dennis et al. (2011), Eagle et al. (2013a), Henkes et al. (2013), Fernandez et al. (2014), and Tang et al. (2014). The orange line represents a least squares linear regression through the synthetic calibration data of Kluge et al. (2015), which we recalculated using the acid fractionation factor of Defliese et al. (2015). The red line represents the calibration of Zaarur et al. (2013), which includes their calibration data from synthetic carbonates as well as calibration data from the synthetic carbonates of Ghosh et al. (2006a). The dashed red line represents an extrapolation of the Zaarur et al. (2013) equation to precipitation temperatures beyond the scope of the authors’ sample suite. The blue line represents the calibration of Tang et al. (2014), which we modified to reflect the acid fractionation factor of Defliese et al. (2015). The brown line represents the calibration of Tripati et al. (2015), which we modified to reflect the acid fractionation factor of Defliese et al. (2015). Open triangles (Stolper and Eiler, 2015), open squares (Passey and Henkes, 2012), the open diamond (Ghosh et al., 2006a) and the open circle (Guo et al., 2009) represent data from calcites used in heating experiments. All dolomite samples from the present study were reacted at 90 °C, and values were converted to 25 °C using a correction of 0.082‰ (Defliese et al., 2015). Error bars on Δ47 represent the standard error of replicate measurements (1 SE). Error bars on temperature (Tθ) values represent 1 standard deviation (1 r). Black filled diamonds represent samples from our suite that did not show obvious evidence of solid-state reordering as described in Section 6.1.2; crosses represent samples that did show evidence of solid-state reordering. The black line represents a least squares linear regression using the St. George Group data that did not show evidence of solid-state reordering. The brown line represents a least squares linear regression as described in Section 6.1.2. (B) As in (A), except with the dolomite data from the present study corrected using the phosphoric acid fractionation factor of Murray et al. (2016). (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
The calibration of Defliese et al. (2015) is plotted as the authors present it in their equation 6. Their equation was derived using their own data as well as a compilation of previously published calibration data (all digested at 70 °C or greater), which they readjust to 25 °C using their new acid fractionation factor. The Defliese et al. (2015) study incorporates data from the following: Eagle et al. (2010), Dennis and Schrag (2010), Dennis et al. (2011), Eagle et al. (2013a), Henkes et al. (2013), Fernandez et al. (2014), and Tang et al. (2014). The calibration of Kluge et al. (2015) is plotted as we recalculated it after adjusting the data (which the authors generated using reaction temperatures of both 70 and 90 °C) using the acid fractionation factors of Defliese et al. (2015) and performing a least squares linear regression:

$$
\Delta_{47} = \left(0.0388 \pm 0.0011\right) \times 10^6 / T^2 + \left(0.2652 \pm 0.0092\right)
$$

$$
(n = 26; R^2 = 0.98; \text{SE}_{\text{pred}} = 0.0126; 95\% \text{CI}).
$$

(2)

The calibration of Zaarur et al. (2013) is plotted as the authors present it in their equation 7. It includes the authors’ calibration data from synthetic carbonates as well as calibration data from the synthetic carbonates of Ghosh et al. (2006a). No acid fractionation correction was performed on the Zaarur et al. (2013) data because all carbonates used their study were reacted in phosphoric acid at 25 °C.

Fig. 6A also includes previously published calibration results from studies conducted in the Tripati laboratory at UCLA using the same instrumentation that was used in the present study. All samples were digested at 90 °C in a common acid bath system, eliminating differences in digestion apparatus, temperature, and constants used in calculations as potential sources of uncertainty. Included in Fig. 6A are: (1) calibration data from synthetic carbonates that were grown at variable temperature, pH, growth rate, and ionic strength, and analyzed both in the Tripati laboratory and at Tulane University, with both labs yielding statistically indistinguishable results (Tang et al., 2014); and (2) a dataset for calcite that was grown at variable temperature and with and without an enzyme that catalyzes equilibrium between dissolved inorganic carbon species present (Tripati et al., 2015). There are several caveats to consider when comparing our new dolomite results to previously published calibrations. First, the measured $\Delta_{47}$ values of the St. George Group dolomites may be lower than the $\Delta_{47}$ at the time of precipitation and entrainment of the fluid inclusions due to possible subsequent heating and solid-state reordering. Second, the potential impact of recrystallization on an atom-by-atom scale can not be determined confidently without further work. Thus, given the uncertainty of what the $\Delta_{47}$ values of the dolomites actually reflect (formation, recrystallization, re-ordering), it is premature to declare that they are most consistent with a particular calibration line. Third, if there are mineral-specific acid digestion fractionation factors as has been suggested by Murray et al. (2016), then our results would be substantially offset, as shown in Fig. 6B. Finally, the magnesium content of carbonate minerals in the calcite-dolomite solid solution is predicted from theory to exert a significant and measurable effect on $\Delta_{47}$ (Hill et al., 2014b), which is supported by recent observations from high-Mg deep-sea coral (Kimball et al., 2015).

With these caveats, we find that a regression through the dolomite data as described in Eq. (1) is consistent with the theoretical relationship for calcite (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009; Passey and Henkes, 2012), and with the shallow slope cluster of calibrations, if the errors in our regression are not taken into account (Fig. 6A). We note that although the slope of this equation is very similar to the slopes of the equations generated by Dennis and Schrag (2010), Tang et al. (2014), Kluge et al. (2015), Wacker et al. (2014), Defliese et al. (2015), and Kimball et al. (2015), the error bounds in our calibration are substantially greater. It is also important to note that the scatter in our data set and the small number of samples in our suite result in a poor coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.58$) and a wide 95% confidence interval (Fig. 6A), and therefore it is possible that the similarity between our results and the previously published results supporting a shallow calibration slope is fortuitous. Hence, our results do not preclude the steeper slopes reported by Ghosh et al., 2006a, 2007; Tripati et al., 2010, 2015, Thiagarajan et al., 2011; Grauel et al., 2013; Zaarur et al., 2013, and Came et al., 2014.

### 7. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, our new $\Delta_{47}$ results provide new constraints on the clumped isotope compositions of dolomites that precipitated in environments of ~73 to 176 °C, and they lay further groundwork for future applications of this proxy to a range of investigations involving dolomites from sub-surface environments. If we assume that calcite and dolomite have the same acid digestion fractionation factor (Defliese et al., 2015), which has been recently challenged (Murray et al., 2016), then over the temperature range of ~73 to 176 °C, our results are consistent with the theoretical relationship for calcite (Schauble et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009). Our findings do not exclude the approach of previous authors who used the theoretical equation to determine the precipitation temperatures of diagenetic dolomites (e.g., Ferry et al., 2011; Bristow et al., 2011; Loyd et al., 2012; Budd et al., 2013; Dale et al., 2014). However, our data are also within error of a range of published calibrations when those calibrations are extrapolated to high temperatures.

We confirm the results of previous authors (e.g., Ghosh et al., 2006a; Guo et al., 2009; Dennis and Schrag, 2010; Ferry et al., 2011; Bristow et al., 2011; Loyd et al., 2012; Passey and Henkes, 2012; Budd et al., 2013; Loyd and Eiler, 2014; Dale et al., 2014; Henkes et al., 2014; Stolper and Eiler, 2015; Tripati et al., 2015) who through heating experiments or studies of field-collected samples found that the $\Delta_{47}$ signatures of carbonates from near-surface conditions can be reset by diagenetic processes. Notably, our results imply that the susceptibility of the mineral dolomite to thermally activated solid-state isotope exchange may be
greater than estimated previously (Eiler, 2011; Ferry et al., 2011; Lloyd and Eiler, 2014). We suggest that Δ47 thermometry has the potential to provide valuable insights when paired with fluid inclusion microthermometry to determine both the temperature at which a sedimentary carbonate formed \((T_h)\) and a higher temperature to which it was subsequently exposed \((Δ_T)\), thereby providing critical information for determining whether a given formation may have been exposed to temperatures within the oil or gas “windows”.
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